

REMARKS

Claims 34-40 were originally pending in this application. Amendments to claim 34 and 35 are made in response. No new matter has been added. Amendment of a claim is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any subject matter.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has objected to the information disclosure statement submitted on 6 March 2006. A new information disclosure statement is submitted herewith having a copy of the foreign patent document.

Oath/Declaration

The Examiner has objected to the oath previously filed. A new declaration is submitted herewith complying with the requirements of 37 CFR 167(a).

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings. Claim 18 has been canceled rendering this objection moot.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to the claims 13 and 14 for being in improper multiple dependent form. Claims 13 and 14 have been amended to correct the dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112 for failing to particularly point out the subject matter of the invention. These claims have been amended to correct more clearly indicate the subject matter of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 20 and 21 for claiming unpatentable subject matter. Claims 20 and 21 have been canceled rendering this objection moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has objected to Claims 1, 3, 7, 15, 19, 23, 24, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable for being obvious over Steinbuch in view of Kos. It is submitted that claim 1 as amended is not disclosed by Steinbuch in view of Kos.

Steinbuch discloses a method in which the tip speed ratio is being used as control parameter for a wind turbine. Tip speed ratio is defined as the speed of the blade tip divided by the wind speed. Steinbuch does not disclose the subject matter of claim 1, which involves changing the blade pitch angle of a first wind turbine which is on a windward side of a second wind turbine.

Kos discloses a multi-mode control system for wind turbines. Such multi-mode control system is applied on a wind turbine which has a rotor that is coupled to synchronous generator to produce electrical energy. The control system provides a blade pitch control which pitch control is used to maintain a maximal (or nominal) power level of the turbine at a constant rotational speed (since the generator is synchronous to the frequency of the power network).

Kos teaches that “during on-line operation a closed loop shaft torque modulates the blade angle to maintain the desired level of power being supplied by the synchronous generator” (column 2, lines 58 – 61). This is further explained in column 5, lines 18 – 33.

Combining the teachings of Steinbuch and Kos would therefore result in a turbine farm in which the pitch control of each turbine is set to maintain a maximal (or nominal) power level of the respective turbine.

However, the present application teaches that in a turbine farm, a first turbine which is in a windward position relative to a second turbine, is set to extract less energy (less than optimal) from the wind in such a way that the wind after passing the first turbine has a higher energy content (the wake loss is reduced) and the second turbine on the lee side can extract more energy. As a result the energy extraction of the turbine farm as a whole increases.

Steinbuch does not teach a turbine farm according to claim 1 wherein by lowering the axial induction (a) of the first turbine with respect to the second turbine so as to extract less energy. A skilled person having knowledge of Steinbuch, would not derive the subject matter of claim 1 from Steinbuch. Therefore, the subject matter of claim 1 is considered not obvious in view of Steinbuch per se.

Also, Kos does not teach a turbine farm according to claim 1 by lowering the axial induction (a) of the first turbine with respect to the second turbine so as to extract less energy. A skilled person having knowledge of Steinbuch and of Kos, would not derive the subject matter of claim 1 from a combination of Steinbuch and Kos. Therefore, it is submitted that the teaching of the present application is not obvious in view of the cited prior art.

Similarly, claims 19, 23 and 29 as amended which relate to the same subject matter are considered to be not obvious in view the prior art cited above.


Accordingly, dependent claims 3-7, 9-10, 13-15, 17, 24 should also be allowable. Thus the applicant respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) rejections to claims 34-40.

Conclusion

Applicants have complied with all requirements made in the above referenced communication. Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and therefore, respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should matters remain, which the Examiner believes could be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the Applicants' undersigned agent.

If there should be any additional charges required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fee in connection with the submission of this paper, now or in the future, or credit any overpayment to Account No. **50-2638**. Please ensure that Attorney Docket Number 72998-013700 is referred to when charging any payments or credits for this case.

Respectfully submitted,



R. Joseph Foster
Reg. No. 56,953

Date: August 16, 2007

Customer Number 08840
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Phone: (310) 586-6565
Fax: (310) 586-0265
E-mail: fosterj@gtlaw.com

LA126912053